DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 280 875 TM 870 205

AUTHOR Bhola, H. S.
TITLE Training of Evaluators in the Third World: Implementation of the Action Training Model (ATM) in Kenya and Botswana.
PUB DATE Oct 86
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Evaluation Association (Kansas City, MO, October 29-November 1, 1986).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Developing Nations; Educational Needs; *Evaluators; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; *International Programs; Models; *Professional Training; Program Evaluation; *Technical Assistance; Training Methods; *Workshops
IDENTIFIERS *Action Training Model; Botswana; Kenya

ABSTRACT

The Action Training Model (ATM) was developed for the delivery of evaluation training to development workers in Kenya and Botswana and implemented under the aegis of the German Foundation for International Development. Training of evaluators is a challenge in any context, but in the Third World environment, evaluation training offers special problems. Typically, evaluation training comes to these countries through outsiders, and quite often within the framework of technical assistance. The development of ATM was based on previous trial workshops conducted in Kenya and Tanzania. The training typically consists of an intense schedule of four two-week workshops. A great deal of trainee participation is encouraged. Current experience with ATM indicates that it shows promise in a technical assistance situation, as well as for use within a Third World country. (GDC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED280875

TRAINING OF EVALUATORS IN THE THIRD WORLD
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ACTION TRAINING MODEL (ATM)
IN KENYA AND BOTSWANA

By

H.S. Bhola

Professor of Education

Indiana University at Bloomington

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

H. S. Bhola

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Paper presented to the American Evaluation Association (AEA)'s 1986 Annual Conference, Kansas City, Missouri, October 29 - November 1, 1986. A modified version of this paper will appear as a chapter in H.S. Bhola, Internal Evaluation of Training and Development Programs to be published by the German Foundation for International Development (DSE), Bonn in 1987.

TM 870 205

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TRAINING OF EVALUATORS IN THE THIRD WORLD: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ACTION TRAINING MODEL (ATM) IN KENYA AND BOTSWANA

By H.S. Bhola

Training of evaluators is a challenge in any context, but in the Third World environment, evaluation training offers special problems. Institutions of higher education seldom have the resources to offer professional evaluation training either to their students in residence or to practitioners already at work in the economy. Government departments of education or special institutes for development training are similarly unprepared to offer such training to their program staffs. Matters are not at all helped by the fact that the initial pool of people with general research background, who could adapt their methodological skills to evaluation, is quite small. Typically, evaluation training comes to these countries through outsiders, and quite often within the framework of technical assistance. The Action Training Model (ATM) was developed for the delivery of evaluation training to development workers in Kenya and Botswana and implemented under the aegis of the German Foundation for Interntional Development (DSE), Bonn, Federal Republic of Germany, that was providing technical assistance to these two countries at that time in the area of training. Our experience with the ATM thus far encourages us to offer it for consideration of those engaged in providing evaluation training in the Third World within the technical assistance framework. The ATM could, and indeed has been, adapted also for in-country use by Third World trainers of evaluation and of development training in general.

It is not difficult to justify the need of evaluation in education and development extension in the Third World. At the very least, the introduction of evaluation would reduce the complacency of bureaucracies and make officials within them feel more accountable. When program officials are themselves trained to conduct internal evaluations, they are likely to become better planners and implementers of their own programs and thereby obtain higher returns on social and economic investments.

The challenge of training evaluators

The task of training evaluators is a challenge under any circumstances. In U.S.A., where a postion of leadership both in evaluation theory and evaluation practice has been maintained during the last twenty years, the problems and issues involved in the training of evaluators are by no means settled (1). The situation is no different in Canada or in other countries of Western Europe (2). In the Third World, Nigeria may be the only country with a Master´s Level university training in evaluation, though single courses in evaluation may exist in the universities in India and elsewhere (3).

The Third World context of training in evaluation

Typically, evaluation training is being delivered in the Third World within the frameworks of multilateral or bilateral technical assistance. This makes the training event a very special educational encounter. Assumptions of trainers coming from abroad must change dramatically in regard to:

1. Learners -- their educational backgrounds, motivations, roles, and socialization for these roles,
2. Training resources such as local training talent, training materials, facilities and infrastructures, and time commitments of everyone involved,
3. Professional linkages with educational institutions and networks of professional challenge and support provided by professional associations, and
4. Institutional norms and expectations; and tolerance for

evaluative information that may bring bad news, in the political cultures surrounding the practice of evaluation.

All this demands fresh consideration of our beliefs in regard to the duration of training events, collabortions with local personnel and institutions, curriculum content of our training, it structure and sequence, qualifications of both trainers and trainees, and methods and settings of delivering training.

Antecedents to the ATM: Workshops in Mwanza and Mombasa

The ATM did not, of course, emerge full-blown in our professional lives. In fact, it resulted from our training experiences over a long period of time. Two training workshops, specifically on the topic of evaluation, made significant design contributions to the ATM as it took shape. One of these workshops was held in Mwanza, Tanzania during 1976; the other was held in Mombasa, Kenya during 1977.

The Mwanza workshop, 1976

The essential themes that I had wanted, as technical director (4) of the workshop to implement in Mwanza were (i) to promote internal evaluation of programs by program practitioners themselves, thereby defining evaluation essentially as a tool for program improvement; (ii) to be responsive to the real and immediate needs of trainees as individuals and of the institutions that sponsored them for training; (iii) to define those real and immediate evaluation needs, participatively, with

the stakeholders; (iv) to demystify evaluation for the participants by translating evaluation theory and methodology in terms of their concrete experiences, in their particular development settings; and (v) yet putting participants firmly on the slow but steady road to professionalization as evaluators.

The Mwanza workshop was actually conducted after long and systematic preparation. The general aims, and objectives, and the possible content and methods of the workshop were thoroughly discussed. A five-page project description was prepared for use as a tool of communication between and among all concerned with the workshop.

Undoubtedly, the most important aspect of the workshop was the participative planning of the workshop. The workshop was indeed "invented" within the local setting. There had been a lot of preparation for the workshop, but it had been general not specific preparation. There were no prior decisions on what lectures will be given, by whom and during what time. The workshop preparation was in fact preparation for a whole set of possible versions of the workshop, only one version of which would be actualized through participative planning for and by the participants, within the context of the local needs of Tanzania, at that particular time in the history of its development programs. Thus, preparation was comprehensive but divergent; the Mwanza workshop was anticipated but had to be re-invented, within the local setting, in participation with the learners.

A related and important feature of the participative approach was the joint partnership among the faculty in the delivery of instruction. All the faculty was to be responsible

for all the teaching. This meant that all instructional inputs were planned together; and inputs for the total group in plenary sessions were delivered with all the faculty present. While one particular faculty member (or a team of two or three) would be formally responsible for a particular presentation, all were informally (and morally) responsible and each was supposed to intervene, if necessary, to make the instructional experience for the participants the best possible in the circumstances. Indeed, the right to teach was extended to the so-called trainees as well who had the opportunity to intervene as and when they thought fit. There was to be no such thing as an interruption.

To further reinforce the participative planning process, and not to inhibit teaching-learning as a "living system", daily programs and time tables were issued only at the end of each day -- to record what had actually happened rather than to have a pre-planned program and a time table to be strictly followed and by which the bell will ring. This strategy contributed both to the processes of participative planning and of formative evaluation of the workshop.

An innovative use was made of the wall space in the main lecture hall. The walls were plastered with paper. The learning needs as generated by individual participants in the planning session were written on the sheets of paper on the walls. These sheets stayed there throughout the period of the workshop. The participants were able to see what they had wanted to see done, what had actually been accomplished, and what still remained to be achieved. They always had a visual picture of the life of

the workshop before them.

The Mwanza workshop was a two-week workshop build around plenary sessions, group work and individual tutoring. Field visits to villages were not included in the program. This omission was deliberate because it was considered unnecessary to take rural development workers, who spent practically all their working lives in the rural mileu, back to visit villages to experience field realities!

There was considerable emphasis on group work, both for methodological and practical reasons. The groups provided an opportunity to all participants to discuss and assimilate important ideas and to be able to work on topics and skills of special concern to them in their particular work situations.

The workshop was steered by the participants through the mechanism of a steering committee. Every evening, without fail, the steering committee met to review the experience of the day and, on that basis, to plan for the next day. In addition to the evaluative mechanism of the steering committee, the workshop was evaluated by sessions, by phases, and, summatively, at the end, to provide feedback to all -- participants and organizers.

Since the workshop was designed locally to meet immediate local needs, it did not necessarily have the integrity of structure and content that would satisfy an evaluation trainer from an academic background. The workshop was, therefore, carefully integrated with suitably designed instructional materials. A monograph was completed specially for use in the workshop, namely, Evaluating functional literacy by H. S. Bhola This was later tested in other workshops on literacy evaluation

and published as a book in 1979 by Hulton Educational Publications, Amersham, Bucks, U.K. (5). The monograph was accompanied by a dossier of instruments in actual use within literacy programs in various parts of the world. These materials played an important instructional role in the workshop. Trainees were formally introduced to the materials. They "walked through" these materials with faculty during the workshop, to be able to understand the part-whole relationship between the content of their particular workshop and the overall subject matter of evaluation. They knew from the written materials what a comprehensive elaboration of a subject or topic would be and how their own specific locally defined needs fitted into the larger picture.

Mombasa workshop, 1977

Both the formative and summative evaluations of the Mwanza workshop were found to be excellent. The same participative approach was, therefore, followed in Mombasa, Kenya in 1977. The workshop was re-invented in Mombasa, using participative planning strategies and was, again, participatively implemented. All the various methodological features of the Mwanza approach were retained; yet in Mombasa we had a workshop that was new and unique to the needs of the Kenyan literacy program in 1977.

Toward the Action Training Model (ATM)

The participative approach was good as far as it went. We were not sure, however, of what happened after the participants left for their homes. Did they retain what they had learned at

the workshop? Had they acquireed enough information and skills in a two-week workshop to be able to do something practical with this information and with those skills as they returned to their posts? Had they, for instance, been able to develop evaluation proposals on their own and implement them? Did they get any support within their departments to conduct evaluation studies, even if they knew what to do and how? An opportunity offered itself for developing a model for the delivery of evaluation training that would anticipate some of these questions and provide suitable answers.

The Non-formal Basic Education Section of the Education and Science Division of the German Foundation for International Development (DSE), Bonn has focussed its interest and resources on the anglophone group of Eastern and Southern African countries. The stragety is to promote development through promoting dialog and training among development workers at various levels in the region.

While planning a long-term program of training of middle level development workers in Kenya, it was decided that training in evaluation would have far-reaching effects on the whole development enterprise, because an understanding on their part of evaluation theory and methodology would have a positive effect on both the initial planning and the implementation of those programs.

It was also decided that such evaluation training should be first delivered to trainers of development workers in the various development training institutions already established in Kenya. By training trainers, the effects of evaluation training

would be greatly multiplied.

Based on the earlier experience in Mwanza (Tanzania) and Mombasa (Kenya), two related approaches were developed and tested as part of what is now called the Action Training Model (ATM) (6):

1. An approach to the delivery of technical assistance (in this case to the delivery of a training program from the outside to development workers in Kenya); and
2. An approach to the delivery of instruction (that is, to the design of instruction as offered to workshop participants).

Approach to the delivery of technical assistance

The approach to the delivery of technical assistance comprised of the following (7):

1. Commitment to the ideology of internal evaluation
2. National workshops combined with multiplier training models so as to build a critical mass of evaluators within the development culture
3. Long-term commitments on the part of all stakeholders
4. Low-cost technical assistance, without ceremony and with honest incentives
5. Commitment to the concept of transfer of responsibility, and
6. Commitment to institution-building within Kenya.

Commitment to the ideology of internal evaluation

DSE subscribed, as did the technical director of the

evaluation workshops, to the ideology of internal evaluation. The idea was to build local evaluation capacity in program practitioners so that they could evaluate their own programs and could, on their own, bring about improvements in these programs. Those trained for internal evaluations can, of course, undertake external evaluations of other people's programs and can collaborate more effectively with external evaluators who come to evaluate their programs, but it was internal evaluation that was the primary focus of the ATM.

National workshops,
multiplier training models

Instead of international, all-Africa or even regional evaluation workshops, workshops under the ATM would be national workshops. Also, participants chosen were to be those who could act as multiplier of evaluation skills by being able to teach evaluation skills to others. That is the reason why participants from development training institutions (centers and institutes that provided training to development workers at the various levels and in the various sectors of development) were given preference. A critical mass of evaluators would thus be created within the development culture of Kenya that would, in all probability, make evaluation a permanent part of development work in Kenya.

Long-term commitments by all stakeholders

Too often technical assistance organizations offer training assistance in terms of a single seminar, conference or workshop. Here there were to be long-term commitments by all

stakeholders. DSE would stay with the project for at least three years to begin with, and would each year sponsor one training cycle consisting of two workshops and a panel. The partner institution (College of Adult and Distance Education -- CADE, University of Nairobi) would also accept a long-term commitment. They accepted evaluation of development training programs as a theme on which they would work for some years to come. Similarly, the workshop participants would make long-term commitments as well, since they were to attend at least one cycle of two workshops and a mid-term panel over a period of one year and keep on working on their chosen evaluation projects outside the context of the workshop. Finally, the resource persons (including the present author who was the technical director of the project in Kenya during 1979-82 and later directed the project in Botswana during 1982-83) had also to make commitments that would be be long-term and consistent. The technical director, for example, could not simply go on other consultancies just because they were more interesting or more renumerative.

Low-costs, high returns

The evaluation workshops under the ATM would not be run as international technical assistance spectaculars, but as low-profile, task-oriented training events without ostentation and ceremony. Workshops were to be run in comfortable but modest hotels. Government sponsored conference centers would be preferred. Participation of trainees would not be "bought" by offering them huge amounts of per deims. Ceremonial openings and closing were to be avoided as far as possible to save resources

of both time and money, unless the search for visibility was part of the plan. Funds available for hospitality were used for building a cohesive community of learners at the workshop and for educational field trips.

Commitment to the transfer of responsibility

There was a deep conviction on the part of DSE and the technical director for the eventual transfer of responsibility to local professionals. This meant that a local faculty had to be developed, by associating with the workshop series, from the very beginning, a select group of professionals with potential. They would learn as they assisted the outside group of faculty in the delivery of training, and would ultimately take full responsibility for such workshops.

Commitment to institutionalization of evaluation training in-country

The workshop had to have an institutional home so that the project did not dissipate and disappear as individuals moved to other interests and places. As mentioned above, CADE was chosen as a partner institution. It was CADE faculty that provided the professionals with potential who would be trained to take the resposibility on the departure of outsiders. Some important institutional inputs were made in CADE such as the provision of a collection of books on evaluation to the CADE library. Later in the life of the project, an Educational Evaluation Resources Committee would be established at CADE. The hope was that training of evaluators would become part of CADE's agenda.

Approach to the delivery of instruction

The approach to the delivery of instruction presented below consists of elements most of which had been tried and tested at the Mwanza and Mombasa workshops. In preparation for and during the Kenya series of workshops, these ideas found further articulations and elaborations and are now briefly discussed below:

1. Effective pre-preparation for workshops
2. Re-inventing workshops locally through participative planning
3. Creating a community of learners for open learning
4. Multiple patterns of learning, and learning in doing, and
5. Learner control of content and structure of training through formative evaluation.

Effective pre-preparation for workshops

As stage actors seem to know very well, naturalness and spontaneity on the stage require lot of rehearsing. Similarly, workshops that would be participatively planned and then participatively implemented require considerable pre-preparation.

Since the ATM was new to development planners and administrators as well as to participants, a detailed "Project Description" was prepared for each workshop to explain things to the somewhat sceptical administrators who wanted to see a program and to the rather anxious participants who had never been asked to participate in developing the content and structure of the workshop they had come to attend and were afraid of being exposed.

Preparing for a workshop that would be re-invented locally through participative planning is like preparing for a set of many possible versions of a workshop: Version,1; Version,2; ..... Version,n. Any one of these possible versions may be demanded by the participants. The organizers have to be more than fully prepared. One can not teach by lecture notes alone!

As part of this pre-preparation, the organizers developed Workshop Handbooks, written specially for each workshop series: one for the evaluation series of workshops, another for the curriculum planning series of workshops, another for the distance education series of workshosp, etc. (8). Writing handbooks clearly provided a good opportunity for preparation in the subject matter, but served other important purposes as well in these workshops. First, a handbook enabled participants to see the part-whole relationship between the content chosen by them for their particular workshop and the possible content of a more comprehensive introduction to the subject of evaluation. Second, these handbooks obviated the need to prepare handouts during the workshops so that all the time and resources of the workshops could be used in concrete instructional encounters of various kinds rather than preparing hastily written and abbreviated lecture notes and duplicating them for distribution.

Re-inventing through participative planning

The "generalized workshop" prepared before coming to the workshop site, is re-invented in the local setting in participation with all stakeholders -- most important of all trainees, but also local faculty, representatives of sponsoring

institutions if they are present, and the organizers themselves.

Another aspect of the participative strategy is the joint responsibility of all faculty in the delivery of instruction. As was pointed out earlier, all instruction was planned together by faculty and participants, and all faculty was present at all the plenary sessions so that everybody was an integral part of the workshop as a "living system."

A community of learners engaged in open learning

A serious attempt is made to change the aggregate of participants who come to the workshop into a cohesive community of learners. Workshops are typically held in "retreat" situations. Such choice of site for the workshop helps in keeping people away from distraction and with each other.

Due attention is paid to the social architecture of the workshops. In the opening session of half a day (or more) all participants are provided the opportunity to introduce themselves and talk about their experiences, their present work and their learning needs. This is seen as more than a ritual, when people mumble and whisper, sometimes with obvious embarrassment, as nobody really listens. Participants are asked to first fill a short questionnaire, which they use to make their introductions, and later deliver to the organizers for more systematic analysis.

Breakfasts, lunches, dinners, tea breaks, and the short and infrequent leisure time activities are all used to contribute to the emergence of a learning community. There is a "bring-in" party to break the ice so that participants get to know each other informally right away. The one week-end excursion is

chosen to combine relaxation with education.

All the above together are known to have created what has been called a "pressure cooker atmosphere" which has brought forth a tremendous intensity of effort on the part of all concerned. In a two-week worshop, formally involving eleven working days, sometimes as much as 120 or more hours of work has been turned out by most participants. Those working on the steering committee have put in even more time.

Learning is made both open and transparent. The use of the wall space, as explained earlier in the paper, makes the structure and content of the workshop transparent for everyone. Participants can see visually what they had wanted to be done, what had already been done and in what sequence, how much of it may be possible to achieve by a particular time, and what might have to remain undone to be picked up at a later panel or workshop.

While there is a formal definition of roles of instructors and trainees, this is not allowed to become rigid. Indeed, participants are invited to practice their right to teach. They are made to feel that their experiences are important and often richer than those playing the instructor role and that they should not miss the opportunity of contributing to the workshop, if and when they do have something important to say. To reinforce this sense of equality and mutuality among all instructors and learners, the seating arrangement is typically tables and chairs arranged into a rectangular form. Every chair around this rectangle is a possible chairperson's chair.

Multiple learning settings, and learning by doing

Instruction was offered to participants in multiple settings of the plenary sessions, small group instruction, and individual tutoring.

Most learning about evaluation planning, evaluation methods and techniques was achieved in the context of developing a proposal for an evaluation study and, later, implementing it. It should be recalled that each training cycle was of approximately one year's duration, composed of two two-week workshops (A1 and A2), with a panel (Pa) in the middle. A second cycle of two workshops (B1 and B2) and a panel (Pb) would overlap with the cycle A as follows:

(A1)...(3-4 months)...(Pa)...(3-4 months)...(A2)
(B1)... etc.

Each of the two periods of three to four months duration were used systematically as part of the training cycle. These are the periods for learning by and in doing -- they provide the time for action. Indeed, it is from this feature that the Action Training Model gets its name. The model is so called because it demands action from trainees in the application of skills learned during training, in their own work in real-life institutional settings. An Educational Evaluation Resources Committee (EERC) had been established at CADE to work with these in-service participants during these periods of field work, and data collation and analysis.

Learner control of training

The Steering Committee as discussed above was a mechanism

of communication and control within the workshop system. It was the major mechanism of formative evaluation and was used to ensure that control for the workshop was with the participants and the local faculty.

The ATM in Botswana

The ATM was later used in Botswana, during 1982-83, to train the district adult education officers of the department of nonformal education of the Government of Botswana, to enable them to conduct an internal evaluation of the Botswana National Literacy Program. In this case, training in evaluation was integrated directly with the task of evaluating the literacy program (9). While the Botswana experience is of considerable substantive interest in regard to the meta evaluation of the evaluation effort, and about what the evaluation study brought out in regard to the implementation of the Botswana National Literacy Program, it simply reconfirmed the usefulness of the ATM both as an approach to the delivery of technical assistance and as an approach to the delivery of instruction.

Evaluation of the Evaluation Training Model

There have been both formative and summative evaluations of the ATM. In addition, the implementation of the model has generated useful informal feedback that confirms the effectivenss of the model.

Formative evaluation of each individual workshop and panel. As we have pointed out earlier, a steering committee was established during each and every workshop and panel to function

as an instrument of planning and evaluation. For instance, at the end of each working day, the steering committee met and asked the same two sets of related questions: (1) What did we do today and how well? Judging from hindsight, is that what we should have done? Could we have done what we did differently and more effectively? (2) Knowing what we know now about our objectives, and reflecting upon our experience in the group so far, what should we do next and how? Such formative evaluation proved to be most significant in the participative planning of the workshops and panels under the ATM.

Summative evaluation of workshops and panels. Again, each and every workshop and panel was evaluated at the end, by using a written instrument asking participants questions in regard to the various aspects of their experience with the workshop under the ATM. Analyses of these summative evaluations, workshop by workshop, are available but it is not possible within the scope of this paper to summarize results from these evaluations.

Systematic evaluations of the workshop series. More systematic reviews and evaluations of the workshop series using the ATM in Kenya have been conducted by Josef Muller, Daudi Nturibi and Tom Mulusa (10). Mulusa summarises the results of his evaluation study thus:

> Prior to 1979, evaluation research was not systematically taught in most basic education and development training programmes in Kenya. The concept of evaluation was widely associated with repulsive connotations such as inspection and criticism. The purpose of the CADE-DSE project on evaluation of basic education and development training programmes was to demystify the concept of evaluation, to develop a core of evaluation trainers for the country to encourage training programmes to evolve evaluation competence in their curricula and to promote the use of evaluation to review and improve educational and development programmes. The project has trained

seven (7) Kenyan faculty and 102 participants of whom twenty five (25) went through the complete cycle of training and completed one or two evaluation studies. A number of graduates of the project have integrated evaluation in the curricula of their institutions, while others have undertaken some evaluation studies either on their own or at the request and on behalf of international funding agencies. The main mission of the project which has been to promote evaluation in existing institutions and programmes has not been accomplished. There is also no systematic programme for follow-up. There seems to be a strong case for continuation of the programme for two or three years to provide more opportunity for institutions which did not benefit from the project during the 1979-86, and to disseminate some of the main outcomes of the project more widely.

Some of the things which Mulusa said had not happended are likely to happen in the near future.

Some other feedback

There has been success with the model on two important counts: transfer of responsibility and institutionalization of the project. The transfer of responsibility for the project to local faculty did take place in June 1982. At the time of writing, the project is still in operation within CADE, University of Nairobi.

The selection of CADE as the institutional home for the workshop under the ATM has proved to be a fortunate one. The project is already semi-institutionalized and the University of Nairobi is considering to make evaluation training a regular part of its curriculum offerings.

On its part, the Adult and Basic Education Section of DSE seems more than ever committed to the ATM concept and now uses this model in all of its workshop series. Many of those who were exposed to the model as local faculty or as participants are now organizing their training in the ATM mode. Unesco Office for Cooperation with Unicef considered it innovative enough to bring

it to the attention of a wider community of practitioners for possible use (11). The instructional materials developed as part of the project, especially the handbook, is in much demand (12). Finally, the series is surviving. People apply for these workshops and, once exposed to them, come back to learn more about evaluation.

An invitation to trainers of evaluators

We like to end this paper with an invitation to trainers of evaluators, particularly those working in the Third World to test this model in use. It is not an easy model to implement. The model makes high demands from the organizers and participants alike and stretches the limits of tolerance for ambiguity of every one involved. However, the ATM seems to bear good fruit. Users of this model will, most likely, end with the feeling of having done something that was relevant, effective, and lot of fun.

Notes and references

1. See Sechrest, Lee, (ed.). Training program evaluators. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1980. Also, Davis, Barbara Gross, (ed.). Teaching of evaluation across the disciplines. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1986.

2. The author has not come across any substantial information about the theory and practice of evaluation in the East European countries.

3. We are referring here to the International Center for Educational Evaluation (ICEE) in the Institute of Education, University of Ibadan, Nigeria.

4. The Mwanza evaluation workshop was planned jointly by Dr. John W. Ryan of Unesco, Dr. Josef Muller of DSE and the author. In Mwanza, we were fortunate to have the collaboration of Yusuf Kassam, previously of the University of Dar es Salaam, and now of the International Council for Adult Education (ICAE), Toronto, Canada and E.P.R. Mbakile of the Department of Adult Education, Ministry of Education of the Government of Tanzania.

5. Bhola, H.S. Evaluating functional literacy. Amersham, Bucks, U.K.: Hulton Educational Publications, 1979.

6. While the author has had the privilege of directing the Kenya series of evaluation workshops during 1979-82; and, later, the Botswana series of evaluation workshops during 1982-83, he gratefully acknowledges the important contributions of his colleague Dr. Josef Muller of DSE and his Kenyan counterparts Joseph Dondo, Dr. Tom Mulusa, Alice Waka, and Daudi Nturibi in the definition and particularly in the implementation of the Action Training Model. Later, in Botswana, Dr. Volkhard Hundsdorfer of the German Agency for Technical Cooperation (GTZ), and now of the University of Mainz, played an important role in the testing of the ATM in a the new setting of Botswana.

7. A description of the test-in-use of the ATM, written immediately after the conclusion of my direction of the Kenya project, and at the beginning of the transfer of responsibility to Kenyan colleagues in June 1982, is included in Bhola, H.S. Action training model (ATM): An innovative approach to training literacy workers. Paris, UNESCO Unit for Co-operation with UNICEF, March 1983. The present description brings longer experience and a larger perspective to bear on the use and test of the model. It should be pointed out here that Unesco, over the years, has been working, apparently with some success, with another model of training in the context of technical assistance as described in de Clerck, Marcel, The operational seminar: A poineering method of training for development. Paris: Unesco, 1976. We were, of course, aware of this model but did not find it suitable for our purposes.

8. Bhola, H.S. Evaluating development training programs. Bonn, German Foundation for International Development, 1982. [ERIC Document No. ED 238 651]. This handbook is currently under revision on the basis of our experiences in Kenya and Botswana, and will be published under the title Internal evaluation of training and development programs by the German Foundation. for International Development, Bonn, Federal Republic of Germany in 1987.

9. Bhola, H.S. "Building a built-in evaluation system: A case in point." Paper presented to the 1984 Joint Meeting of the Evaluation Research Society and the Evaluation Network held in San Francisco, October 11-13, 1984. [ERIC Document No. ED 256 779].

10. Examples are: Muller, Josef, "Evaluation of basic education and development training programmes." Bonn: German Foundation for International Development, August 1980. Nturibi, Daudi N., "Experiences in training evaluators from training and development programs in Kenya, 1979-82." Bonn: German Foundation for International Development, January 1983. Mulusa, Tom, Evaluation of basic education and development training programs: Mid-term evaluation of a workshop series. Nairobi, College of Adult and Distance Education, University of Nairobi, April 1985.

11. Refer to note 7 above.

12. Refer to note 9 above. The 1982 edition is out of print and is not available any more from DSE. However, it is available through ERIC under Document No. ED 238 651.